

3. Remarks

The Examiner has rejected pending claims 1 and 3-20. The applicant has amended independent claims 1, 9, and 16. No claims are currently being added or cancelled.

A. Claim Rejections—35 U.S.C. § 103 (claims 1, 3- 7, and 9-19)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-7, and 9-19 as being unpatentable over US2004/0019794 to Moradi et al. in view of U.S. 6,263,330 to Bessette. The applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the following reasons.

In response to the applicant's previous amendments concerning the assignment method for the prescription identifier of the present invention, the Examiner has cited Moradi et al. for the teaching of a unique prescription identifier that is assigned sequentially. In fact, however, Moradi et al. teaches a unique identifier for *pharmacies*, not for individual prescriptions that are filled at those pharmacies. In paragraph [0166] cited by the Examiner, Moradi et al. teaches the use of a National Association of Boards of Pharmacy (NABP) number. This number “is a 7-digit numeric identifier assigned to licensed *pharmacies*” that is used to “identify *pharmacies* to various payers” (emphasis added). Moradi et al. does not teach or suggest a numeric identifier that is sequentially identified for individual prescriptions. The independent claims of the present application have been amended to clarify that the prescription identifier of the present invention is unique with respect to each individual prescription, not to the pharmacy that fills the prescription. For this reason, the applicant

respectfully submits that the cited combination does not render the claimed invention obvious, and the rejected claims are therefore allowable.

B. Claim Rejections—35 U.S.C. § 103 (claims 8 and 20)

The Examiner has rejected claims 8 and 20 as being unpatentable over US2004/0019794 to Moradi et al. in view of U.S. 6,263,330 to Bessette and in view of US2004/0006490 to Gingrich et al. The applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the following reasons.

Each of claims 8 and 20 are dependent upon one of the claims for which allowability was discussed above over Moradi et al. in view of Bessette. For the same reasons as presented above in connection with the claims from which these claims 8 and 20 depend, the applicant respectfully submits that the rejected claims are allowable.

C. Conclusion

With the amendments made herein and for the reasons provided above, the applicant asserts that all claims in the application are allowable, and reconsideration and allowance is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

06/18/2010

/chuck dougherty/

Date

Reg. No. 41,715
Telephone: (501) 371-0808
Facsimile: (501) 376-9442
Customer No.: 47990

J. Charles Dougherty
Wright, Lindsey & Jennings LLP
200 W. Capitol Avenue, Suite 2300
Little Rock, AR 72201-3699